

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-24 and rejected same. This paper requests entry of an amendment to the independent claims, claims 1 and 15, and changes to various of the claims depending from claim 1 to correspond to the change made to claim 1. Such changes include canceling claim 7. Thus, claims 1-6 and 8-24 would be pending.

Applicant has studied the Examiner's very thorough response to applicant's arguments traversing the rejections of the previous Office action, and thanks the Examiner for proposing an Examiner's amendment addressing a concern of the Examiner. For the reasons given below, though, applicant requests entry of the amendment indicated by this paper, and reconsideration of the claims as amended.

Changes to the claims

Claims 1 and 15 are changed by this paper to recite that the first device prepares a message including information indicating a folder of a first data store of the first device, and then sends the message to a second device, with the information indicating the folder placed in the message in an element or field different from where data of the first data store is placed or would be placed if included in the message.

The changes to the claims are intended to clarify that the invention, unlike the prior art, indicates a folder for holding data in a separate part of a message from where the data itself is or would be communicated if included in the message. (If a data unit is being deleted, the data obviously need not be communicated in the message.) For example, the folder information can be communicated in the header of a SyncML message and data can be communicated in the body of the message. As explained in the application at page 17, line 19, to page 18, line 2:

... To make a change to a data unit, SyncML according to the prior art calls for a message referencing the data unit within a DATA element nested in an operational element. It is the use of a reference to affected folders external to the DATA element (i.e. a data description element) that gives the invention advantages over other possible arrangements for referring to affected folders (namely, not having to duplicate code enabling SyncML parsing by each application, and not having to include in each sync agent code for interpreting the data units of each different application).

Referring now to Fig. 2, thus, according to the invention, folders (and thus the data organization in terms of directories) affected in the course of synchronizing the data stores 11c 12c are identified or indicated in the LocURI elements 26a 27a of the Source element 26 and the Target element 27 of a protocol command element 25 (such as replace) external to (i.e. not contained in) a data element 28 29 (i.e. a particular type of data description element).

As further explained at page 19, ll. 6-11:

When addressing a data unit in a folder (as opposed to the folder itself), the folder's identifier and the path of the folder with respect to the root of the directory structure (in case of a tree structure) is transferred within the LocURI of the Target and Source common element types of an operational element, i.e. a protocol command element (such as Replace or Delete).

Thus, the invention provides that in case of data having been newly stored as a data unit in an either new or existing folder in the data structure of the first device, the message would indicate the folder (name and location) in a non-data element part of a SyncML message (e.g. an "item" element), and the data in the data element part.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 8-9, and 11 are changed to correspond to the changes made to claim 1.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

At section 6 of the Office action, claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in reference to SyncML Initiative (including standards and specifications for SyncML, SyncML Representation

Protocol, and SyncML Sync Protocol, SyncML Device Management Protocol).

Claims 1 and 15 are the only independent claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the invention as now claimed in the claims is clearly distinguished from the applied art. None of the applied art, namely AAPA indicated above, teaches a first device sending a message to a second device with information indicating a folder placed in the message in an element or field different from where data of the first data store is placed or would be placed if included in the message. As pointed out in the application, at page 17, ll. 18-21, to make a change to a data unit, SyncML according to the prior art (what is referred to as AAPA above) calls for a message referencing the data unit within a DATA element nested in an operational element.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §103 of claims 1 and 15 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and similarly for the other claims now pending, in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

17 Jan. 2006

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Retter

Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234

Cust. No.: 004955